

March 14, 2003

Public Safety and Security Committee Member,

First, in general, I would like this committee to know I oppose the majority of what is being proposed. Who are you trying to stop? Criminals? or Law Abiding citizens? The more I read these proposed laws, there will be more criminals in this state than citizens based on the wording of these laws.

We are all horrified by the senseless act of a sick individual who took the lives of 26 innocent victims in Newtown and yes even his own mother. However I believe there has been a rush to "do something" in the wake of this tragic event. Governor Malloy already gone on record stating Connecticut is in the Top 5 states with the strictest gun laws in the country.

The real problem is enforcing the laws we have, and ensuring people being treated for mental illnesses cannot acquire firearms. I fully support measures to keep guns out of the hands of non-law abiding citizens and making crimes involving guns as strict as possible.

SB 506: An act requiring criminal background checks for all private firearm sales
I Strongly Oppose

- Understand, I am for universal background checks, what I am NOT ok with is the wording of this bill. In its current form, it is full of ambiguity and unintended consequences. Please define transfer? Will I not be able to lend another legal gun owner one of my rifles for a hunting trip without a background check? Or better yet, what about a visitor to this state (since we are open for business) whom I want to go hunting with?

SB 1076: An act concerning the reduction of gun violence (To enact various initiatives to reduce gun violence in this state including expanding the definition of assault weapon, requiring a rifle permit for the purchase of a long gun, requiring registration of firearms, establishing a gun offender registry, regulating the sale of ammunition and eliminating the bulk purchase of firearms.)

I Strongly Oppose

There is so much wrong with this bill I am not even sure where to start.

I Oppose the current and any NEW regulations to limit owning/using Modern Sporting Rifle's

I Oppose ANY form of registration

I Oppose the Ammunition Permit and process

I Oppose the Rifle Permit and process

I Oppose limits on ammunition and firearms purchases

I Oppose limiting where I can purchase my ammunition

1. No provisions in 1076 or similar bills with registrations for firearms that are not owned by individuals. Many gun clubs own firearms for use in youth sports and various other activities.

2. There are no provisions for non-resident hunting licenses and registration. The current language can make an out of state hunter visiting CT a potential criminal. How many of us may go hunting with friends and relatives when they visit?

3. How will out of state hunters and residents that come to this state for firearms related activities be able to purchase ammunition? If they don't have a firearm registered in the state (under these bills) they have no means to purchase ammunition? Take a quick look at the license plates at Cabela's. Plenty of non-Connecticut plates in the lot. Doesn't Connecticut want the revenue?

4. Freedom of Information Act provisions. The current proposal has NO protection for citizens with a long arm permit or ammunition card. Pistol permits are exempt from FOIA requests. Do we really want to give criminals a shopping list of "whose house to hit"?

HB 6162: An act concerning ineligibility for a permit to carry a pistol or revolver or an eligibility certificate based on a prior hospitalization

I Strongly Oppose

- Are you saying that people cannot be rehabilitated? Doesn't that go against everything this state government has been touting with the early release of prisoners?

HB 6251: An act requiring fingerprinting and criminal background checks prior to the sale, delivery or transfer of all long guns

I Strongly Oppose

- Understand, I am for universal background checks, what I am NOT ok with is the wording of this bill. Please define transfer? Will I not be able to lend another legal gun owner one of my rifles for a hunting trip without a background check? Or better yet, what about a visitor to this state who I want to go hunting with?

HB 6595: An act prohibiting the discharge of firearms near private residences -

I Strongly Oppose

- The legal wording on this bill is left to far for interpretation. If I need to defend myself in my home and legally shoot an intruder, will I be charged with this offense sense my neighbors house is less than 500 feet? Also by reading thing bill it would seem that police officers can be charged with discharging there weapon near a home.

It is obvious that these bills were thrown together as a response to a horrible tragedy. This is bad policy. There is way too much area for interpretation and unintended consequences. This is **NOT** how laws should be made, especially since

the laws already on the book are **NOT** being completely enforced. How about you enforce the laws on the books? How about you do not let people plead out on gun chargers? How about you do not let criminals out of prison early? How about you make a law that requires the police to make a "check-in" when they get DENIED by the NICS system?

As a responsible citizen and gun owner, I take the legal right to protect my family very seriously. Taking the firearms out of the hands of law-abiding citizens will only leave them in the hands of criminals who will not recognize or follow any law you implement and put our safety in jeopardy.

Disarming the citizens that want to be armed and protect themselves is not making your citizens safer. In fact you are making us less safe by doing so. Can you please tell me why how and why it is ok to pass these laws that without any proof whatsoever that they will actually have an effect to stop gun violence?

Limiting my ammunition capacity and the type of firearms I can own and use? Where is your proof that these laws will make a difference? In fact I think the proof is non-existent and actually the total opposite that is true. Why does law enforcement use magazines with greater than 10 rounds? Why do they use AR-15's? They do so because they are the best tools for the job. Your citizens should be able to protect themselves with the best tools also since the police cannot be everywhere. Where were the police during the Cheshire home invasion?

Please ask the rank and file police officers (not the Chiefs that are behind a desk) how important the number of rounds they carry are during a life or death situation. It is my belief that if it is good enough for our police officers it is good enough for the citizens they protect. I also believe (as I mentioned above) and you know that the police cannot be everywhere so it is my responsibility to be able to protect my loved ones from harm.

I ask that you'll continue to stand behind the law-abiding citizens that support you and vote against any legislation that further infringes on our 2nd Amendment right. In regards to any of the above or other anti-gun legislation, I will actively work against anyone who votes in favor of these bills. I will urge every person I know, whether they own firearms or not, to do the same and make sure that legislature is not reelected. We will turn the next election into a single-issue election because you felt like you had to do "something". How about you do the RIGHT thing?

Sincerely,
Mark Daigle

